

## Appendix A

### LAND AT NEULAND STREET, EYNHAM

#### PLANNING COMMITTEE PRESENTATION JULY 2015

1. I hope that members found the site visit useful. To recap, there are a number of reasons why the proposal differs from the previous proposals and why it offers benefits:
  - The extent and footprint of built development is reduced from previously.
  - There is now provision of a mix of housing units including smaller units for local people.
  - The design has taken references from local buildings – the set back from the road frontage behind the existing tree belt will help screen the development and reduce its impact to an acceptable level.
  - The access is in a new location where there is a natural gap in the trees and to the satisfaction of Highways. Those trees to be lost for the access have been surveyed as of low quality with a limited remaining life span.
  - The repair of the stone boundary wall is proposed to enhance the frontage.
  - Finally it is proposed to retain a significant area of open land as a community orchard and to protect the setting of listing buildings.
  
2. I would like to thank officers for their engagement with this proposal and I support their conclusion that this represents a sustainable form of development which has responded to and preserves the character of the area.
  
3. Your officers have recommended the scheme for approval subject to a Section 106 agreement. I would like to briefly highlight and clarify the terms for that agreement.

4. Firstly, Dr Ferrier the landowner is positively seeking that the proposed land for the community orchard is secured in perpetuity.
5. This is to both help preserve the setting of The Gables and make provision for apple growing as a local tradition. This can be secured in the S106 agreement as a form of covenant.
6. The land is proposed to be leased to the local Orchard Group of the Eynsham Green Tea organisation for management of the orchard but with wider public access to the orchard being managed by them. If not already, there will be an option for the orchard group to take ownership of the land at the end of the initial lease.
7. Secondly Oxford Homes has agreed in principle to the Parish's request for contributions to local infrastructure of £40,300.
8. Thirdly, Oxford Homes has made an offer of £5,000 per unit (or £65,000 in total) towards affordable housing.
9. As noted in the committee report, the scheme falls below the adopted affordable housing policy threshold and contributions were not initially sought. The contributions are now proposed under the draft Local Plan.
10. We have submitted a viability appraisal to your officers which justifies the sum offered as the most that the scheme can support whilst still being viable. We have received no comments or objections to that appraisal from your officers.
11. Together the Parish and affordable housing contributions total over £100,000 towards local infrastructure.
12. The design of the scheme and benefits which it offers means that the scheme is compliant with relevant policies and it is hoped that you can support the officers recommendation for approval.

## **Lowlands planning PC 3 Minutes – Land to the North of Cote Road (15/01550/OUT)**

Good afternoon

The Parish Council object to this application. The location of the proposed site would involve construction outside the built envelope of the village, into open countryside, which is contrary to the criteria for development within Aston in both the current and the emerging Local Plan.

Additionally, contrary to the applicants claims the development does not meet the sustainability criteria within the NPPF.

We recognise that the provision of a five year land supply will be a major deciding factor in this application. We strongly urge this committee to stand firmly behind its position in its own emerging Local Plan target of 525 homes per year which delivers in excess of a five year supply.

Should this committee look to approve the application, the Parish Council would wish the following items to have conditions set against them.

The application includes a large area of new open space at the rear of the site which would then potentially be developed in future. We would wish to see the layout of the site changed so that this area of land cannot be accessed by the new road to be built within the site. Alternatively, the new open space could be subject to a binding restriction against future development.

Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. We would wish to see a 'Grampian Style' condition imposed.

This site must be connected to the main sewerage system. It would not be an acceptable proposal for these 41 houses to deliver treated water into the ditch system as has been approved for the 38 home site, to the south of Cote Road

We would wish to see the full WODC Leisure and Communities recommendation of s106 contributions for both Sport/ Recreation Facilities and Play Facilities as a condition.

Additionally in view of the concern expressed by residents over road safety that consideration is given to additional s106 contribution to install a traffic calming scheme on Cote Road.

As a final concern. If this application is approved, then taken together with the other applications which have already been approved within the last year, there will be an additional 91 dwellings built within Aston within a very short time frame – this represents a 20% growth above the current number of dwellings.

Thank you

*Richard Haines*

*Chairman: Aston, Cote, Shifford and Chimney Parish Council*

Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this committee meeting. Given the positive recommendation made by your officers, and mindful of the long agenda ahead, I do not intend to take too much of your time. I would however like to make a few salient points which I hope will aid your consideration of this application.

Your officers point out in their committee report, that the Council has stated that in order to meet its housing targets some development will be needed on Greenfield sites on the edge of settlements. In this context I consider this site to be a logical extension to the settlement, in a suitable location, which represents an excellent opportunity for sustainable development.

It is clear that this proposal will make a valuable contribution to both market and affordable housing, in the District. This is particularly relevant given that the pressure to find housing within the District that will increase year on year as the requirement to maintain a five year land supply moves forward.

I would urge you to consider this application in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development rather than whether the site is contrary to specific policies of the Local Plan. With this in mind your officers highlight that the key questions that should be asked in determining this application:

- 1) Whether the site represents a suitable and sustainable development opportunity, and;
- 2) Whether the benefits of the proposal outweigh any potential harm

Having carefully assessed the proposal, reviewed the technical reports submitted with the application, and considered all the consultation responses, your officers have concluded that the answer to both these questions is "yes" and that the development is acceptable.

In reaching this conclusion your officers have highlighted that there have been no objections to the development from any formal consultees.

In assessing the proposal, regard must also be given to the considerable benefits arising from the development. The key benefits can be summarised as:

- 1) The development will make a valuable contribution to the supply of housing in the District.
- 2) The development will make provision for up to 50% affordable housing. The Council's head of housing advises that in the region of 70 households in Aston qualify for affordable housing. The provision of around 20 new affordable housing units therefore represents a significant contribution.
- 3) The development will provide housing in a sustainable location. The County Highways Authority raise no objections to the proposal and paragraph 5.16 of the officer's report highlights that they consider the development is located within easy reach of local facilities and services and that it has a number of travel choices particularly walking given its close proximity to local facilities.
- 4) The development will enhance the landscape setting of the village. The application proposes sensitive landscaping particularly to the eastern site boundary. The officer's report notes (5.15) that the Council's conservation officers consider that there is the potential for the creation of a village gateway which could significantly enhance the setting of the conservation area and help to better integrate the housing estate to the west into the wider landscape.
- 5) The application will bring numerous economic advantages, ranging from the creation of jobs during the construction phase to the increased spending that will arise locally by the addition of 41 new homes for around 100 residents.
- 6) The development presents the opportunity for enhanced ecological habitats through sensitive landscaping and implementation of a landscape and ecological management plan.

It has been brought to our attention that there is some concern regarding the disposal of foul waste from the development. I can confirm that the utility provider is currently modelling the sewer system and should any upgrades be required they have both the time and funds in place to undertake any potentially required upgrades prior to occupation of the development. This will in any case be subject to a planning condition to allow this issue to be resolved prior to the commencement of development.

I believe that the positive recommendation set out in the committee report is testament to the commitment of the applicant to secure a high quality development on this highly sustainable and suitable site.

I thank you again for your time. And I thank your officers for their efforts on this planning application to date.

**Committee 20 July 2015 – Adv and LBC**

1. Thank you Chair. My name is Ben Cook and I am from Pegasus Planning Group who represent the applicant, Bill's Restaurants Ltd.
2. As you know, advertisement and listed building consent is sought in association with the approved shopfront at Bill's Restaurant. I am speaking in favour of both these applications, but will only be speaking once.
3. These applications relate specifically to the proposed non-illuminated fascia sign and externally illuminated hanging sign as shown on the drawing behind me.
4. The lighting will be switched on during the permitted trading hours of the restaurant, 8am – 11pm Monday to Saturday, and 9am – 10:30pm Sundays and bank holidays. The lighting will then be switched off by the duty manager upon vacating the premises shortly after the restaurant closes to the public. The lighting will therefore not be left on overnight.
5. *The proposal originally included illumination to both the fascia sign and the hanging sign. However, during the determination period, the illumination to the fascia sign was removed following discussions with the case officer.*
6. *The applicant is aware of the objection made by Witney Town Council regarding the illumination of the hanging sign. However, this objection was made before the removal of the illumination of the fascia sign. It is thought that this objection concerned the cumulative impact of the hanging and fascia signs, and that the*

*subsequent revision to the proposal should go some way to addressing the Town Council's concerns.*

7. The advertisements proposed are in keeping with the context in which they are set, and preserve the significance of both the listed building and the conservation area. They are appropriate for a Town Centre use and serve to support a competitive and vibrant local economy.
8. It is therefore respectfully requested that Members agree with the Case Officer's recommendation and grant advertisement and listed building consent for this proposal. Thank you for your time.

Council meeting 20<sup>th</sup> July

Good Afternoon, my name is Steve Cridland and I am representing the residents of Minster Lovell.

1. Regards this application there have been no comments of support and over 160 objections, from 173 residents, including a letter of interest from David Cameron.

2. Previous planning applications and an appeal for this plot have been dismissed for issues which remain today. The application demonstrates no solutions to the issues, but will actually magnify the negative impacts and is non-compliant with current planning policies:

a. The introduction of compact urban style town houses, some of which are 3 story will detract from the historic nature of Minster Lovell and impose on a listed Chartist building as well as many other residential properties.

The road layout of the proposed development is also set out to allow incremental development of land to the south.

b. Highway safety – (e-mail extract from *Chris Nichols, Highways Development Control, Oxfordshire County Council*)

“In reality the submitted plans, together with on-site observations suggest that the actual visibility at the proposed access is likely to be greater than that required and demonstrated on the Glanville drawing”

The introduction of a major access junction, opposite the single entrance to 3 residential properties with equestrian use, will significantly increase the risk profile of the highway in the immediate vicinity.

It is clear that the proposed access location is not fit for purpose, with absolute minimum safety design standards being used as part of the application as adequate relevant road safety standards cannot be achieved.

c. Sewage, the current system is at capacity, with frequent issues having been experienced at various manholes in the village, particularly in the grounds of the listed building 86 Brize Norton Road. Thames Water “has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application”

Any addition to the system may well see the re-emergence, of sewage flooding in the village.

d. Flooding from surface water. The Environment Agency identifies the area of the proposed development as an area of low level risk, which feeds into a high level risk area, which are the grounds of private properties at the south-east corner of the proposed development, is the applicant going to underwrite the insurance premiums for these properties and take on the on the maintenance regime currently funded by the Parish Council?

In conclusion, the village residents object to over development in Minster Lovell and ask the committee to take the issues raised in the 160 plus objections, into due consideration in rejection of this application.

**Jonathan Stowell – Representing Minster Lovell Parish Council**

**Notes on Contribution to WODC Lowlands Planning Committee Meeting 20<sup>th</sup> July 2015**

- **Strength of feeling against this proposal**
  - Over 160 responses from Parishioner
  - Attendance at Meeting
  
- **Precedent Setting**
  - Seriously damage character of a historic ‘linear’ village
  - This site has ‘form’ in sense of 3 previous application rejections
  - ‘Back Land’ under constant threat from developers
  - Fact recognised by WODC rejection when site proposed for SHLAA
  
- **Sustainability**
  - Primary school already oversubscribed by 15 /year  
No prospect for significant expansion according to OFSTEAD
  - Poor/failed bus service (S7 in place of S2)
  - Long established local businesses mean few employment opportunities
  - No medical/dental facilities
  
- **Transport/Traffic**
  - 100 – 150 extra cars/vans
  - Used for School, Work, Shopping and Leisure
  - Impact on busy, narrow BNR – especially at rush hours
  
- **Site Issues**
  - Flooding. Site in middle of identified Surface Water Floods Risk Area
  - Overcrowded with significant impact on properties in Ripley Avenue
  - Totally inadequate provision for car parking
  - Poor and dangerous access to BNR



## Appendix G

Miss Hill spoke in opposition to the application expressing her concern with regard to traffic generation arising from the development and the consequent congestion on the Brize Norton Road, the absence of a pedestrian footway, the lack of public transport, potential flooding and the adequacy of the sewerage system. She also noted that the local primary school would be unable to accommodate additional pupils and reminded Members that the site had been considered inappropriate for inclusion in the SHLAA.

Miss Hill considered the application to be inappropriate and concluded by making reference to existing issues with both the water and electricity supplies.

***Mike Gilbert Planning***

62 Broadmarsh Lane Freeland Witney OX29 8QR

Tel: 07974 294463 [mg.planning@btinternet.com](mailto:mg.planning@btinternet.com)

**Land west of Brize Norton Road, Minster Lovell**

**15/01783/OUT**

**Key points:**

1. Site has a history of being considered for development - not taken forward in the past as the site was not required or justified in terms of housing need. Very different circumstances today in relation to housing need and the planning policy context.
2. A good number of green field sites in sustainable locations such as this will need to be developed to meet the identified substantial housing need - particularly the short-term. It must be better to develop sites such as this rather than more environmentally sensitive sites such as land east of Woodstock or the Windrush Valley on the edge of Witney.
3. Officer report acknowledges the sustainability credentials of Minster Lovell and the limited visibility of the site.
4. The site is not subject to any environmental or other planning designations - not CA or AONB.

5. The site is an unused area of rough grassland which relates more to the built-up area of Minster Lovell than the open farmland beyond - it is visually very well contained - belt of deciduous woodland along the west boundary. The proposal will make good use of the site.
6. This is only an outline application seeking to establish the principle of the proposal and the means of access. Issues re. heights of buildings, impact on neighbouring properties, parking courts, and design can be resolved at the RM stage.
7. The linear nature of Minster Lovell is acknowledged - the proposal is development in depth. But the site is not at all prominent so any harm would be limited. And greater weight needs to be given to the extent of housing need, including the need for affordable housing.

Hello

Thank you for letting me speak, I am speaking on behalf of no 8 and no 10 Cotswold Way.

We are objecting to the proposed houses.

They are claiming that these are chalet bungalows, when they are clearly 2 storey houses. These new houses are directly bordering 10 properties, 7 of these properties are single storey bungalows and plot 2 is bordering only single storey bungalows apart from the Wilsons house.

The conservatory on no 10 Cotswold Way has been missed of the plans again and is clearly in the 21 metres separation area.

These properties will have a very major impact on the bungalows on Cotswold Way being a lot taller and overbearing, Also the bungalows at no8, 10 and 12 will be directly looked over by the dormer window on plot 2, This window looks down directly into the gardens and the bedrooms of these bungalows, as the bedrooms are on the rear of these properties and will also look directly into the conservatories of no 10 and 12 Cotswold Way.

My main bedroom at no 8 Cotswold Way will be in direct eye line sight and if we went to bed with the curtains open they would be able to watch us sleep on the bed as the window looks directly down into are bedroom, We would also lose privacy in 90% of are back garden and would be totally over looked by these overbearing houses and go from a property with almost total privacy to having no privacy at all.

Yours sincerely

Alan Major (no 8 Cotswold Way).

My name is Rob O'Carroll from DPDS consulting and I speak on the half of my clients Mr and Mrs Wilson.

Mr and Mrs Wilson have successfully run a construction business from the land to the rear of 99-101 Burford Road, Carterton since 1972 and have lived in the property at the front of the site throughout this 43 year period when I have brought up and raise their family.

Mr and Mrs Wilson very much see Burford Road as their home and at this stage of their lives do not wish to move on and set up again, particularly as the host property has been comprehensively adapted to cater for Mrs Wilson needs making her daily life far more comfortable. They very much see this property has a home for life.

However due to age and ill-health the construction business has now ceased operate, leaving a large area of brownfield land vacant.

It would undoubtedly be of great benefit to the local area if the construction yard element were removed, as to all intent and purpose as it stands now the site could in the future be brought back into use again to the detriment of local community. The redevelopment of the site would also remove a number of less than desirable structures from the site.

It is considered that the principle of this is not disagreed with by officers.

Given the timeframe hereby allotted, it would appear that there are two key issues, which offices raise concern which Mr and Mrs Wilson would like to address, which are follows:

### **Overlooking of properties on Cotswold Way**

Following advice provided by Officers during a previously withdrawn application, the layout of the proposed development was revised in order to achieve the suggested 21 metre separation distances between the proposed dwellings and existing residential properties surrounding the site.

The half dormer window was also introduced into the scheme following advice from Officers as originally it was proposed that a Velux style window, situated above head height would be used in order to prevent overlooking, however Officers then raised concern that this would provide poor living accommodation for future residents.

It should also be noted that the window serves a bedroom only and therefore the time spent by future looking out of the window is likely to be limited to fleeting glances and the half dormer is the only window, which could be looked out of, as all other windows serving the first floor will lights deliberately positioned above head height.

In addition DPDS have provided additional evidence in the form of detailed sightlines drawings, which illustrate that due to the existing trees, outbuildings and the positioning of windows within the proposed properties that opportunities for overlooking would be minimal, which appears not to be taken into consideration by officers.

Notwithstanding this Mr and Mrs Wilson would be agreeable to condition securing additional landscaping to along the northern boundary in order to provide further screening and comfort if members consider this to be appropriate.

### **Overbearing Impact**

The area immediately surrounding the application site consists of numerous dwelling houses all of differing sizes, shapes and importantly heights, so it is not uncommon for bungalows to be sited adjacent housing and the taller buildings to form the backdrop to those with fewer storeys.

In this case due to bungalows being located to the north and west and two story properties to the south and east, chalet style bungalow were deemed to be the most appropriate solution to achieve a sympathetic transition between the two. The difference in height between the proposed properties and the

bungalows on Cotswold Way at ridge height level is 2.43 metres and therefore due to the distances between the properties this would not be unduly overbearing or intrusive. For these reasons it is therefore considered that the proposed dwellings as proposed would not give a dominant or incongruous appearance to the street scene or character of the local area. This is demonstrated by the 3D model prepared by DPDS and submitted with the application.

It should also be noted that the proposed density of the scheme is very low compared to that which could come forward on this site, however this was the wish of Mr and Mrs Wilson so as to ensure that the development remained in keeping and characteristic of the locality.

To conclude, it is hoped that I have provided Members with some background to the case and the reasoning behind the proposals now being considered.

The proposals have been carefully thought out and the advice and suggestions of Officers followed throughout in order to meet with the Councils required standards. The proposed dwellings will bring benefit to the local area through the removal of the construction yard, as well as delivering much-needed high-quality housing that with the Council's adopted standards.

They will also allow Mr and Mrs Wilson a sympathetic way of subdividing their currently large land holding, which is currently unmanageable and to remain in their family home, in which they have lived for over 40 years.

If appropriate I will be happy to answer any questions otherwise it is hoped that members will look favourably on his application through the grant of planning permission.

Thank you Chair.